AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. I.—MARCH, 1889.—NO. 3.

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS AND "THE VULGAR."

> "And by the word 'Vulgar' I understand all such as have not enrolled themselves as students under the supreme natural science, whether they be simple folk, or physicists, or politicians, or otherwise men of culture." (Metaphysics of the Schools. Thomas Harper, S. J., Vol. I., Introd. xxii.)

SINCE during the last decade the general attention of the thinking world has been directed to the study of Thomistic philosophy, not a few persons of intelligence have confessed themselves puzzled how to decide upon the real merits of the scholastic system, when regarded in the light of advanced and practical science. They hear it, on the one hand, extolled with unqualified praise by thinkers who, though Catholics, are admitted to be familiar with the broad field of general philosophical speculation. On the other hand there are metaphysicians, scientists, and historians of high rank who are equally outspoken in condemnation of a system which they stigmatize as trammeling free investigation and true development of thought. If amid these conflicting opinions the inquisitive mind turns to the volumes of St. Thomas,

in order to decide for himself a question on which authorities so radically differ, he will in many cases incline towards the opinion of those who pronounce the whole Thomistic method "an amalgam of obsolete theology and dialectic hairsplitting." Under such circumstances the educated Catholic naturally addresses himself for an explanation to the priest, who, it is understood, has received his mental training in philosophy and theology after the model of the scholastics, and who may be supposed to know the merits of the system. Why, then, we hear it asked, is there this difference of judgment about St. Thomas? Why should men, even though they may have no sympathy with the creed of the author of the philosophic "Summa," neglect or belittle a method for which it is claimed that it has no equal in training the mind to the accurate perception of truth, and the discovery of error? Why is it, too, that even Catholics, if we except the more or less professional students, should at all fail to appreciate this same system, which must doubly recommend itself to them, because it comes from a source which they reverence, and is employed in the demonstration of truths with which they agree both on intellectual and on moral grounds? Surely, these are not idle questions, for, though they have, perchance, been answered many times, they come to us again and again. And those who ask them are for the most part men sincere as well as educated, and often influential in society for promoting truth and weakening prejudice, and hence qualified to aid in the better understanding of the Thomistic discipline, which the Sovereign Pontiff has recommended to the schools, high and low, as a leaven, which would raise and give a healthy taste to the mental food with which the ailing body of modern society may be hopefully nourished. To effect this cure of the social body by means of Thomistic science, the latter must be popularized. It must not, as hitherto, remain the exclusive property of the hard student, the learned and speculative. That it is possible to make the teaching of the Angelic Doctor accessible to the unprofessional student is being proved where the

ground has been sufficiently prepared for such work. Père Lavy, a French Dominican, has made the attempt, and we may say successfully, of treating in the form of conferences some of the difficult questions from the "Summa," for the benefit of an intelligent laity. A like work is being done, in various ways, in Germany. In England, Father Clarke, with the aid of a number of professors of philosophy at Stonyhurst, has undertaken the publication of a course of manuals of Catholic philosophy which have a similar aim, that is, to make the English reader familiar with the teaching of the Angelic Doctor, divested of those technicalities of language and that strangeness of form which present the main difficulty in its being rightly appreciated.* Thus, whilst at present there are real obstacles to the general understanding of the merits of St. Thomas, ere long all this may be changed. For just as the physical sciences, formerly sacred domain to the lay reader, are to-day wonderfully facilitated, even to the intellect of a child, by easy lessons clothed in pleasant form of story and illustration, accurate enough to develop a taste for their pursuit later on, so the strange life and growth of the faculties of the soul may be studied by less arduous steps than heretofore, and a system of psychology offered, not, it is true, to children, but to the intelligent lover of truth, in digestible form, of easy lessons in philosophy, and further illustrated through the varying attractions of general literature. But let us point out in detail the difficulties that make, at present, against the fair and full appreciation, without and within, of the Thomistic system; for, if the latter is to be made popular, it will be of no little importance, as a first step to such work, to examine the ground upon which the seed is to be sown; to find out, not only the nourishing power, but the barren spots as well, the depth of

* These volumes, of which the first is already in the hands of the public, are published simultaneously in this country. (Benziger Bros.) We are informed by the Publishers that the second volume of the series, entitled "First Principles of Knowledge," by Rev. J. Rickaby, S. J., will be out in a few days. The plates for the third volume, on Logic, are on their way here.

loam and gravel, and the side whence sweeps the frosty wind.

Among those who misunderstand the scholastic method, there are, in the first place, the men whose prejudice lies in their will. Such are the enemies of the Church. They hate the method because of the truth to which it is inseparably linked. To this class belongs not only the aggressive atheism of modern schools, but religious heresy as well, which seeks to justify the errors of its heart by the manner of its reasoning. Next comes the weaker clan of superficial minds, whose vanity prompts them to give themselves importance by condemning what they do not understand. It often happens that these have followers superior to their leaders in intellect, for we all know that intellectual ability is no safeguard against pride or vanity; that the best minds are sometimes prostituted to the service of error, from human considerations. These, therefore, cannot be deemed fair judges of the theology or the system of St. Thomas. They are of the world which hates truth, or of the world which, loving its own, loves darkness. What wonder that the Spouse of the Rejected, the keeper of the true light, should be in bad repute with them? If they have social virtue, as is often the case, their interests are, nevertheless, somewhere between Cæsar and the rabble; and though, like the Roman Procurator, they may stand in the very presence of truth, and even ask, "what is truth," they will not wait to hear it. How much more pleasant to the human sense is it to fondle the offspring of its own fancy, to build upon hypothesis and the airy deceptions of the senses, rather than, following the inexorable logic of facts, to dig laboriously down to the sources of things, until you reach the first cause, the ultimate end, which to secure demands many a sacrifice from among the fairy phantoms of this life.

But if the unreasoning prejudice of hatred, error, or vanity has done much to obscure the merits and prevent the fair appreciation of St. Thomas, there are other real difficulties in it which repel at first sight the ordinary mind. These arise partly from the nature of the subject matter, and partly

from the form in which it is presented to such as are unschooled in the ways of hard and exact reasoning. As the system stands it is meant for students alone, and I do not know whether, even if the Thomistic mode of reasoning be made popular by a circuitous route, much change could be made in it for those who pursue it in the higher schools of philosophy. At any rate, the student who courageously enters upon it, overcoming the hard beginnings, experiences by degrees a fascination which is like to no other fascination upon earth. The taste of wisdom is sweet indeed, and the mind that once apprehends truth never wearies of its pursuit, because that truth is at the same time the eternal beauty of things divine. But even to the lover of truth there is some technical difficulty, if I may so call it, at starting. Begin where he may, he has for the time to assume some as yet undemonstrated factor. Whether we start with God as the first principle of all things, or the phenomenon as the last result of a first principle, it is always like a problem in algebra with two unknown factors. You must assume, ere you can yet have proved it, one or the other as of definite value, in order to reach with certainty the real value of both terms.

Again, there is the language. It is a new and unfamiliar terminology to most men who have not been trained up in it. Yet it can hardly be otherwise. Every science has its peculiar terms and forms of expression. The more remote it is from the daily uses of life, the less familiar to the ordinary ear will be the words employed to denote the things it treats of. It is true that the coined words of the modern sciences give us some warning that they mean strange things, whereas the scholastics use well-known and accepted terms in a sense often entirely different from their vulgar acceptation. But the question would in most cases be whether the scholastics have changed the real meaning of such words, or whether usage has done it in later times. It can hardly be expected that a science so old and so fundamental in its character as metaphysics should alter its terminology, once that had been fixed.

It was not a matter of accident with St. Thomas to adopt the language of the schools in his own day for the new system which he evolved. If there is a lack of elegance, it arose partly from respect for antiquity, partly from necessary conditions of the time. The fostering of classical forms, which the humanists made later on their principal aim, had not entered into the minds of men who simply meant to vindicate truth for all time by putting it upon a safe basis, by means of a rigorous process of reasoning. Aristotle had, as it were, laid the foundation of exact thinking more than three centuries before the Christian era. The Greek version of his works, first turned into Arabic, and thence into Latin, had been for ages the text of the lectures delivered in the philosophic schools. When, therefore, the teachers of the newly founded Universities began to give definite scientific form to the theological branches of study, they naturally adhered to the exact and close reasoning of the philosophers, both because it was best adapted to the mental training of their hearers, and because it was the safest path by which to avoid or limit the wild vagaries of free speculation. Whilst the language of Aristotle gave, as it were, the framework of scientific construction, the writings of the Fathers, who recorded the traditions of the Church, together with the Sacred Scriptures, furnished the material from which the edifice of Catholic theology was built up. Who would dare change the words of the old masters of Christian doctrine cited in illustration of its principles by the schoolmen, even though the expression had in them something of the Cordovan poets, "pingue quiddam sonantia." It would have been as irreverent as it was dangerous.

But, as we have already intimated, there is another view of this question of the language of St. Thomas. Even if in some respects it might be purified, we cannot meddle much with its terms without destroying the utility of the system as a mental discipline to the schools. To the regular student there is great help to reasoning in that directness of argument,

which goes with brevity and with the use of terms and formulæ when they are known to him as having a definite value, so that the severer forms of the system as it stands are in his case more valuable than any other. However, for the world of intelligent readers, with whom the study of philosophy is more or less an elegant and useful recreation, the "Summa" must, indeed, be offered in somewhat changed form, in dainty morsels, which are at the same time easily digestible. And this the special characteristics of our race and age make even more necessary than would be the case were we more intellectually robust and less afraid of thorough mental labor than on the whole we are. No one will reproach us with being an idle people. In mercantile enterprise there are few like us. We pitch our tent anywhere, north or south, afraid of nothing, and, by all odds, out-do the Romans, whom even the good-natured Horace chides because

> —neque fervidus
> Pars inclusa caloribus
> Mundi, nec Boreæ finitimum latus,
> Duratæque solo nives
> Mercatorem abigunt.

If we give anything to science, it is to such as has its worth rather in the concrete, the physical and experimental, which administers to our gain or comfort. Even the study of metaphysics is with us largely reduced to the science of mere psychology, whose value lies more in its application to sociology or medicine than to simple truth. Of the study of ontology hardly any notice is taken by the later philosophers perhaps because it leads to truth in the purely supernatural order, without apparent relation to the negotiable commodities of this world, and without facilitating the art of agreeable living or stimulating our sense of curiosity, by which we love to follow the physical phenomena to a degree which the progress of mechanical science has made possible in these days. Yet, whatever is added to our knowledge of the relations of things, must it not all rest on an unsafe foundation until we have ascertained the nature of these things themselves?

Every one who attempts to teach philosophy to beginners in that science will bear me out in saying that it is extremely difficult for the latter to realize the existence of anything in the world of matter or spirit beyond the mere external phenomena, of which their senses make them conscious. Most of our modern philosophers, if we except those who actually adhere to the scholastic system, fairly ignore this fundamental question of "Being," and hence it is doubly difficult to make the tyro recognize its importance.

Besides this prevailing tendency of modern progress, which only recognizes the material, the physical, even in metaphysics, there is an additional obstacle to the right appreciation of the scholastic philosophy arising out of our prevailing system of education. We confound, as Father Harper very pertinently puts it, "the education of the intellectual faculties with the acquisition of knowledge." Some of the best and most representative educators in our American public schools have called attention to this fact of cramming the mind with knowledge, no matter how accurate and valuable in itself, before the faculties have been trained to the proper use of such knowledge. Mental suppleness, health, and strength, is attained, not by carrying heavy loads, which rather stunts the faculties, but by frequent exercise in certain movements, which, though by themselves perfectly useless, are by no means so in their results. One good principle in the intellectual as well as the moral sphere will serve a man in a thousand cases of fact and under varying circumstances. But the principle does not come out of books or a prodigious memory. Our school system is most successful in the development of memory, which, however, far from making patient and laborious students, skims with flash and sound over wide ranges of subjects, never going down to the more solid depth, on which all else must rest. The newspaper is, therefore, our most satisfactory mental food. Wisdom is bought, at a penny the double sheet, and, like canned fruit, is accounted always fresh because always ready for practical use. Such modes were not con-

templated when St. Thomas proposed the problems of life and eternity, fit subjects for the study of every age, to the practical solution of men who felt that the wisdom they sought was worth living and dying for.

There is another cause which prevents the easy introduction of the Thomistic system unto our present generation, and which is particularly applicable to us. It is a certain erroneous but widely prevalent notion about independence of thought. The girl graduates of our high schools assert their "right" to be agnostics. The "right" undoubtedly they have, but reason they have not, unless it be the lack of reason to be anything better. Books of the learned, arguments of the grave and experienced, are nothing to them. They follow their "convictions," the product of too limited knowledge. Any plausibly written novel, such as Mrs. Humphrey Ward's, determines their philosophical and religious creed. It matters nothing to them, for it happily or unhappily escapes their critical faculty, that the two leading arguments of the story are contradictory, that the "divine right of passion" contradicts the assumption that religion itself is merely a sort of passion, which must be subject to reason's right divine. Alas for the scenic trickery which beguiles of all people those who most loudly claim the free exercise of reason.

Kindred with this exaggerated assertion of independence of thought is a certain contempt for past things and usages. With us, where everything great is at the same time new, and where "the average man" of to-day is, as Matthew Arnold has put it, "too much a religion," the old historic figures and ideas do not inspire the same reverence as formerly. Above all, we cannot convince ourselves, at least without some serious effort, that the men of the "dark ages" could possibly have known anything which we do not know in this bright, new, nineteenth century world of ours. It may, indeed, be urged that, since St. Thomas wrote so long ago, when the physical sciences were, to say the least, in their swaddling clothes, his doctrine must needs miss a good many of the sober

facts upon which new conclusions have been based, and which can by no means be ignored even in the treatment of metaphysics. This is true, but whilst the doctrine and method of the Angelic Doctor suffer no more from new discoveries in physics and kindred sciences than do the conclusions of Euclid in mathematics from these same facts, we shall find in the principles of the "Summa" a most excellent touch-stone whereby to test the rightful value of the new discoveries in their application to metaphysics. For although St. Thomas, in that vast text-book, takes note of pretty much every phenomenon known to empiric science of his day, it is only by way of illustration. Should they prove false, he can easily dispense with them without injury to his principles, which are not based upon this or that phenomenon, but upon an unalterable chain of absolute evidence. If new illustrations are brought forth by the aid of applied science, as is abundantly done in our day, they need only grooping under some of his fundamental categories. Indeed, this is evidently the very meaning of the Sovereign Pontiff when he explains that the "Summa" of St. Thomas should be read without the notes of the commentators, whilst at the same time he urges the thorough study of the modern sciences, to be interpreted "ad mentem Sancti Thomæ," for only thus can the threatening movement towards practical pantheism be prevented.

It is sometimes objected that, truth being simple, why should there be need of such elaborate machinery for its exposition as the "Summa" presents, which must necessarily confuse the ordinary mind? Besides, the history of opposing schools, which arose from the various interpretations of St. Thomas, shows that it is, after all, not so clear a matter of following him directly towards undeniable truth. To this we answer, that the "Summa" is, indeed, a gigantic system of many parts, one dependent on the other, and the relation of which appears only to the careful student.

But this is natural enough when we remember that it deals with universal truth and universal error; that it is a labor-

atory wherein every species of being is to be analyzed and tested; a machine constructed of a thousand wheels and more, which are necessary, owing to the multiplicity of the demands made upon it for exact indexing of every item in nature. There are strange forms, but they serve each a purpose, and to understand their use one has but to start at the beginning and patiently take piece by piece. He will find nothing obscure, nothing useless. Principle and proof are before us. We have but to understand the terms. These, as far as need be, are defined with absolute care. True, there are in metaphysics things which defy definition. It is the case in every science which deals partly with abstract, partly with concrete subjects. The analytical chemist has a principle that "the want in some instances of a theoretical explanation does not render a generalization valueless, and we obtain what is called "graphic formulæ," which consistently represent all the reactions by which certain substances are formed or transformed." And so the mental science has its graphic formulæ, perfectly legitimate and proved correct in their application to definite facts. If, in spite of this, men cavil about the meaning of the Angelic Doctor—it is not so much that they have derived their difference of views from him as that they had their views before they went to St. Thomas to seek in his words a justification of their various opinions. That will, of course, be possible, so long as language is not a perfect equivalent for thought and feeling. The Holy Scriptures are a standing proof that even truth unerring cannot make herself understood by all alike. Again, the patent fact is urged that precisely since the scholastic method went into disuse, the mind of man, left free and by a process, as it were, of spontaneous evolution, has discovered many truths hitherto unknown.

No doubt, many truths have been discovered since the days when the scholastic method was exclusively in vogue in Christian schools. But the discovery of truths does not necessarily mean a furtherance of truth. If men have during the last two centuries made progress in developing truths,

they have also made progress in developing errors. And if we examine their relative weight against the weal of humanity we shall find an abnormal loss. Whatever of truth we have discovered amounts on the whole to facts, whether intellectual or material; for to the knowledge of principles, received from reason and revelation, but little can be added. But whilst the main gain of progress by investigation is the accumulation of facts, the increase of error is altogether in principle. A false theory does immeasurably more harm than simple ignorance of facts could do under the worst circumstances. And what is more, the facts so discovered may, and most frequently are, made to serve the propagation of error. Facts are not always truth, as errors are not necessarily falsehood. Yet our progress means simply discovery of facts, whilst our errors mean mostly development of false and baneful principles.

Thus freedom of speculation, like genius, by a certain power of intuition may produce admirable results, but you cannot rely upon it. It rears at times, like nature, unaided by reason, magnificently ornamented crystal avenues of stone or ice; but then, who would contract for such grand works with nature, benevolent and artistic though she be? Certainly we would not deny that there are aids to reason which lie outside of it, which sharpen and quicken it in some indefinable way. Indeed, taking the writings of St. Thomas as they are, there is necessary, in order to follow him throughout, something of that light and insight which he himself possessed and derived from a higher source than intellect. "Great men," Mr. Lilly makes Luxmore say, "interpret the law of the universe, which is the law of God and therefore the perfection of ethics, more clearly than others, because they discern it, in one province or another, by the intuition of genius." We would say, by the light of faith. In forming our judgment of things we may be guided by reason alone, or by faith alone, or by both combined. In the last case we distinguish not only what is the supernatural and real good at which we must aim, but also how to determine best the means among

the things of earth by which to reach that end. Though this supernatural prudence is not always incompatible with acts or even habits of sin, yet the latter more or less blind the reason and dull faith. But in souls wholly free from wilful sin, in which grace finds that perfect peace and calm favorable to its operations, there are wrought out the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Of these some affect the intellect. They are knowledge, understanding, wisdom. The first imparts that faculty by which the mind judges correctly of human things. The second penetrates and closely enters into the truths of faith; whilst wisdom, encompassing, as it were, both nature and faith, discerns their mutual relations and traces them back to their ultimate causes. In proportion as we lack this gift, shall we find it difficult to comprehend its use in others and how it bears consistently towards definite truth.

We have not attempted to give any sketch of the system of St. Thomas, such as it is, nor suggested how in detail it may be popularized, because it would take us beyond the limits allowed in the present article. But it will be clear that, if there is reason for the "vulgar" prejudice against St. Thomas, the reason is not the weakness or faults of that system, but, on the one hand, the bigotry and vanity of those who wantonly assail it, and on the other the obstacles, natural or accidental, of a deficient training, of a tendency manifold towards materialism, and social bias, which goes with this age and country.

Two things must strike any fair mind in connection with this inquiry. First, that the Church, so cautious, throughout her whole history, in espousing the teaching of any man, whether sage or saint, has for centuries stood sponsor both for the doctrine and the system of the humble disciple of Albertus Magnus. America herself bears witness to the fact. Two hundred years ago, when the city of Quito applied to the Holy See for the theological faculty of its new university, Innocent XI., in a Bull dated July 23, 1681, granted four chairs, on this condition, that the "Summa" of St. Thomas

should be taught and explained in the university.* To day a Pontiff whom even the liberal world considers more progressive than conservative, a man of science and of wisdom, too, bids his sons take up these same tomes and find in them anew the love that will confound the worldly wise, that will serve as an invincible rampart to faith, that will provide rich and healthful food of the mind, so that, *viribus validi et copioso armorum apparatu instructi assuescant caussam religionis fortiter et sapienter agere.* †

* Vid. Op. S. Thomæ Aq., Parmæ, vol. I. p. XXXIV.

† Encycl. Æterni Patris.

EFFECTIVE PREACHING.

IT has been said that men are like rabbits. To get right hold of them one must catch them "by the ears." No doubt of it. If Protestantism has still any organized representation of its principles, it is owing to the preachers who, though their melody is pure negation, manage nevertheless, Arion-like, to draw souls against the prevailing current and save them from infidelity. The Catholic Church does not rest her main strength upon the preaching of the word of God. She has the power of the apostles, to cast out demons, to cure the diseases of mankind, to raise the dead, in short, to work the manifold miracles of grace through the sacraments, in virtue of her mission. A secret power goes out from her, responding to the silent touch of the humblest soul in the crowd. Yet, as in the case of her divine founder it was "the multitude who came to hear Him," which "sought to touch Him,"* because from His word they knew that healing strength issued from Him, so it is the multitude of the faithful, to whom the divine words are repeated and explained, who profit by the vivifying virtue of the sacraments. Thus preaching becomes an essential preparation and accompaniment to the proper and useful bestowal of those celestial gifts of which the Church is keeper and her minister the dispenser. The Council of Trent enjoins it especially "during the season of the fasts, of Lent, and of Advent of the Lord, daily or at least on three days of the week, if the bishop shall deem it needful."† How needful the bishops with us regard this duty is evident from the words of the last Council,‡ which,

* Luke vi. 18, 19.

† Conc. Trid., Sess. XXIV., c. 4.

‡ Conc. Plen. Balt. III., pag. 117.

repeating the injuction of Trent, adds the obligation (omni consuetudine aut prætextu in contrarium non obstante) of preaching at all the Masses on Sundays and festivals, even during the summer season, (etiam æstivo tempore—omnium omnino missarum quibus adstant fideles, sive illæ missæ sint cantatæ sive privatæ). These sermons must, of course, be short. They are to follow the reading intelligibly of the gospel, which is never to be omitted,* and which will generally suggest the subject matter of these discourses. One cannot speak with effect in the pulpit unless prepared, and even when the sermon is very short it needs some definite outlining of thought before-hand. The so-called "five minute sermons" are an excellent aid to the priest for this purpose. A pastor in Belgium, on whose table we found some years ago a Flemish translation of such short sermons issued by the Paulist Fathers in New York, assured us that this simple combination of catechism and gospel did great good in keeping the people loyal to their faith under the then existing opposition of a semi-infidel government. According to such models similar compositions may easily be adapted by every one for his own use. The principal point is to be convinced that there is something to be brought home to the people. Some evil to be avoided; some abuse, of which observation and the experience of the confessional have taught him the existence, to be eradicated; some virtue, which the gospel of the day suggests, to be inculcated; some doctrine or practice of the Church to be explained. In nearly every case the catechism supplies definite points. The habit of noting down one's experience in particular cases, or some sort of observant attention in reading, will furnish the memory with apt illustration. The proper use of the Concordance and Holy Scripture will give authority, unction, and that appeal to the heart which is resistless with those who have the grace of faith, because it is God's own convincing word. That is all. It needs some writing, but in most cases not much. Only an

* Ibid.

accurate definition of the main proposition which is the subject. A simple syllogism, with proof in brief of each part to be found in the Roman catechism, clad in pleasing and intelligible language, and the concluding exhortation, couched in some words of Our Lord or the Apostle, is such preaching as will delight and be useful to every Catholic worthy of the name. This sort of sketch, made and born for some days in the mind, fixes itself like a conviction upon it. Meanwhile observation furnishes examples, which are most effective because real, and being real, are apt to stimulate our own interest in the truth we wish to bring home. And a man knowing what he wants to say and wishing very much to say it will never lack the proper words. If the sermon of another is committed to memory there is always the danger that it will sound hollow. Even if we ourselves are not conscious of a certain stage-effect, it rarely escapes the observation of others, and if it be without the rhetorician's appliances there will be a lack of vitality. The kind-hearted will fear a sudden stop and compassionate the preacher, and those who have a keen sense of the ridiculous will have all sorts of distracting thoughts, so that the sermon is likely to profit only the blind, if there be any, and the deaf, who wait patiently for the end. The best way to get command of an audience, to forget oneself, and to have the words ready without a prompter, is to think seriously for some time: what do I want them to do? There is one danger to guard against in exhortations thus prepared. It may happen that, when we wish to chastise a fault, for example to brand the want of faith or reverence, or the neglect or obstinacy of our people, our own natural sensibility may happen to feel wounded, and the slight of God's command may be at the same time a violation of our personal rights and privileges. Under such circumstances it is easy to find words, and the sarcasm or anger of a human spirit takes the place of that dignified remonstrance and paternal solicitude which alone befits the sacred chair. The less we are prepared on these occasions, the greater the danger of hurtful excursions. Bishop

Ullathorne has some admirable words on the subject. "I have been young, and I have grown old, and I understand this style," he says. "Instead of falling back on his final resource, on those elementary doctrines with which he is always at home, the preacher yields himself up to his inward provocation, nurses the sore of his wounded fancy, gives the old Adam his way, lets his warmed imagination follow her unpleasant fancies, and breaks over his congregation in a distempered fit of scolding that damages himself and damages them. If he be vain as well as weak in spirit, he will imagine he has given a powerful discourse, and that the relief he feels after firing off his temper is a sign of the good he has accomplished. If he have spiritual sense, that is lost but for the moment, he will feel shame and regret. If you consult the faces of the people as they leave the church, they seem to say: We looked for the spirit of God, and have found the weakness of man." * There are some themes, also, which, if given too prominent a place in these exhortations, weaken the reverence and authority of the holy place: "De stipendiorum aut reddituum tenuitate sæpe sæpius verba facere," says the Balt. Council, "præsertim asperiori modo, summopere dedecet ministrum Christi et locum sacrum." †

The sermons at the late Mass on Sundays and festivals and at the special devotions during the year in the evenings are expected to be more elaborate. They are prepared after the examples given in the classes of sacred rhetoric, and differ in their disposition according to subject and character. But even these sermons will generally effect good in proportion as they possess the qualities of brevity and simplicity. St. Francis de Sales, whom we may suppose to have been a pleasing speaker, tells us that for a time he used to commit the fault of long sermons, but that afterwards he corrected himself. Fénélon, in his Dialogues on Eloquence, warns the preacher against fatiguing himself and conceiving a distaste for preaching by the labor of memorizing long sermons,

* Eccl. Disc. XI., 278. † Tit. VII., 215.

which, moreover, weary the hearer. As to simplicity, he quotes St. Augustine, of whom he believes that he never wrote his sermons, saying: "Preachers should be more clear in their language than others, because custom and deference prevents their being interrogated, as to their meaning."* For the rest, this great preacher was opposed to the writing of sermons unless in exceptional circumstances. His own discourses, as written by himself, consist mainly of notes, and he evidently practised all the excellent rules he has laid down of how to attain the art of effective preaching. Yet, whilst we do not believe it advisable to deliver the regular sermons preached to our congregations at the late Mass and similar occasions without having written them at least in the main, it is to be remembered that "preaching is neither a display of rhetoric nor an exhibition of literature, nor a glibness of tongue. It is not an exhibition of the man, interposing his borrowed finery between Christ and his people." Originality is not always the best thing, and the good thoughts and sayings of others may be judiciously used to advantage in a sermon. But, aside of such casual use, it is a much better method to form a personal habit of expressing oneself with elegance and correctness by constant intercourse with the best models of sacred eloquence, which include the S. Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church. If the love of Cicero is a sign of progress in the art of oratory, as Quintilian argues, it is similar with the masters in pulpit oratory. Their mode of analyzing the subjects they treat, and which are the same with which we have constantly to deal, their way of viewing the same topics, their pervading spirit, gradually gain upon the frequent reader. Few men fail to improve their style from habitual converse with the cultivated speakers of the past and present. Once that acquired, almost any material will become flexible in their hands, assimilate itself to their method of thinking, and render composition not only easy but a pleasure. If to this is added —as indeed we must suppose—that remote and permanent

* Histoire de Fénélon, lib. iv., 261.

preparation for the pulpit, which consists in earnestness of purpose, deep conviction regarding the apostolic office of the priesthood, and love for souls, then the speaker, whatever other gifts he may lack, will be sure to exercise that fascination which bends the will of his hearers and is more powerful, more lasting, than are the charms of skilful oratory. If a good memory be the only faculty employed in the preparation of sermons, they will, as we said of the short discourses, often miss their mark, besides being apt to instil a dislike for the work of preparation. There is something mechanical even in the best committed discourse, unless it be also the brain and heart-work of the speaker. Something does not fit the place, or the person, or the time. In these days of prying intelligence, cheap literature, and scant sermons, the preacher who "borrows" the words of his discourse from a book may hear himself complimented on his faithful memory by some clever member of his congregation. There are cases recorded—if not true certainty not unlikely—where an invited friend preached in the evening the sermon which his audience had listened to in the morning from their own studious pastor. The abbé Dieulin tells how the sexton of a church, endeavoring to chase a dog who was disturbing the preacher by his barking, received a rebuke from M. de la Motte, who was listening, saying: "Let the poor creature alone—he is barking at a thief."

THE PRIVILEGED ALTAR AND OUR MONDAY PRIVILEGE.*

A PRIVILEGED altar, in the common acceptation of the word, is an altar to which the special favor of a plenary Indulgence, applicable to the poor souls in purgatory, is attached whenever Mass is said thereat, according to the prescribed rubrics. The effect of the Indulgence is restricted to one soul, † except for "All Souls Day," when every altar is privileged for the benefit of all or any number of the souls in purgatory. Whilst it is plenary in itself, according to the intention and the dispensing power of the Church, it is applied to the poor souls "per modum suffragii," and the measure of its application rests with the wisdom and mercy of God. It is, nevertheless, the most certain and effective means to aid the poor souls, because the Indulgence is directly attached to the sacrifice of propitiation, which does not depend upon the merits or personal dispositions of the minister of the altar, but on the oblation of the divine victim. The Sacred Congregation of Indulgences has never answered the question of whether the state of grace in the celebrant is an essential condition to the obtaining of this Indulgence. ‡ But to gain it the Mass must be celebrated "de Requie," whenever the Rubrics or special faculties permit it. (1) On other days the Indulgence goes with the "missa de die." The privilege of the altar was originally local or *reale*, that is, attached to a certain place, so that any one celebrating Mass at such an altar and observing the Rubrics as to color and rite would

* The numbers throughout the article refer to the decrees of the S. Congregation, which are given in full at the end.

† S. C. I., 20 Aug., 1864.

‡ Decret. Auth., n. 253 ad 3; 341.

obtain the Indulgence. With us the Bishops have under ordinary circumstances the power of granting the local privileged altar: "Declarandi privilegiatum in qualibet Ecclesia suæ diœcesis *unum* altare, dummodo aliud privilegiatum non adsit, pro cunctis missæ sacrificiis, quæ in eodem altari celebrabuntur a quocumque presbytero sæculari vel cujusvis ordinis regulari." * The words "in qualibet ecclesia" apply to all churches and chapels wherein parochial functions, such as Baptism, Funerals, etc., are ordinarily performed. † The altar to which such a privilege is attached must, unless a particular indult dispense with this requisite, be an "*altare fixum.*" There has been some misunderstanding on this point. In liturgical language an altare fixum is one which has its "mensa" or table inseparably joined to the base, all of stone. Such altars only can be consecrated. But the Congregation of Indulgences uses the term in a less strict sense, and means *any altar which is permanent*, without requiring that its mensa be one piece of stone or inseparably joined to the base. ‡ An "altar stone," inserted in an altar which is not removable in the ordinary sense of the word, is enough to constitute the "altare fixum" for this purpose. "Sufficere ad constituendam qualitatem altaris fixi, ut in medio altaris stabilis et inamovibilis, licet non consecrati, lapis consecratus etiam amovibilis ponatur. § The indulgence is, then, attached to the altar, *not to the altar stone*, as is, moreover, expressly declared in a letter of Card. Fransoni, Prefect of the Propaganda: "Privilegium *altari conceditur, non lapidi*, qui unus alteri pro necessitate vel opportunitate suffici poterit." * It would, therefore, not destroy the privilege, even were one to remove the altar stone and insert another, or to use the same altar stone in different places. If the altar which is privileged be destroyed, the new

* Acta S. Sed., I., 42. † Decr. Authent., n. 219 ad 3 et 4.

‡ Resp. 20 Mart. 1846. Decret. n. 334, 1; vid. Beringer, S. J., Die Ablässe, II., 3, pag. 449 (ed. 1887).

§ Rescripta Authent., n. 405, pag. 319. 26 Mart., 1867 (ibid.)

* Decr. Authent., n. 334, (20 Mart., 1846).

altar built in its place, (2) or even in some other part of the same church, provided in each case it retain the same title or patron, retains the privilege of the Indulgence intact. (3) But if the altar be removed to another church, or if the church be rebuilt in a different place, the altar, even though the title remain the same, loses the privilege. (4)

We said that the *privilegium reale altaris* requires a fixed altar in the sense explained. But it can also be obtained by special Indult for the portable altar, in such a way that it could be *attached to the altar stone.* This would have to be expressly mentioned in the petition, though not necessarily in the answer. If the writer were to seek an Indulgence for such an altar, *portable* as it is called, without saying so in his request, the grant of the privilege, even if obtained, would be null and void. *

Besides the privilege of a Plenary Indulgence applicable to the poor souls, which is attached to the celebration of Mass at a certain altar, and which is called *privilegium reale,* there exists the *privilegium personale,* by which a priest celebrating at any altar, under certain rubrical conditions, gains the same Indulgence. The conditions are that a *Missa de Requie* be said whenever possible. Hence a priest enjoying the faculty must make use of such days as allow the Requiem Mass, and cannot transfer his intention to any other day he may choose. (5) As to the intention, it must be directed to one person; but if a priest say Mass according to his privilege for a number of persons, without forming any particular intention, the indulgence is thereby not lost, since the gaining of the same does not depend on the celebrant, but on the authority who grants it and God who accepts it. † Hence, also, the celebrant may gain a Plenary Indulgence for himself, by reason of the holy Communion he receives, at the same time that he offers the Mass at the privileged altar for the poor souls. (6) A priest who enjoys the personal privilege of the altar for a certain number of days in each week, if he join a

* Ibid., n. 295 et 315.

† Acta S. Sedis, XIII., pag. 142.

confraternity (congregation) which has the same privilege, does not lose his own by reason of the aggregation, unless the Indult expressly states the contrary. (7) Many priests obtain this favor of the privileged altar directly from Rome. Those who make what is called the "heroic act of charity for the souls in purgatory," have the same privilege *ipso facto* for every day of the year. In general, special faculties are granted to missionary countries, by which it is allowed on certain days. With us, in the United States, there is a faculty ordinarily communicated to priests through the Bishops, which reads: "Singulis *feriis secundis* non impeditis officio novem lectionum, vel eis impeditis, die immediate sequenti, *celebrandi Missam de Requie* in quocumque altari, etiam portatili, et liberandi animas secundum eorum intentionem a purgatorii pœnis per modum suffragii."* Let us explain this faculty right here. †

As the clause stood, without interpretation, it gave rise to the question of whether the expression *officium novem lectionum* referred to ordinary semi-double feasts as well as to doubles. If so, we could not enjoy the privileged altar on semi-doubles, though we might certainly say a Requiem Mass, as this is permitted by the general Rubrics. The late Father Konings left an interpretation which was published after his death (Comment. in Facultat. Apost. n. 77, edit. 1884). He says: "'Officio IX lectionum,' adde: nec festo duplici aut die infra octavam aut feria quæ non permittunt missam de Requie." Whether Father Konings could have known of the existence of any other interpretation at the time when he wrote the above, we cannot surmise, but there existed at the time of its publication an answer given to the Vicar-Apostolic

* Facultates Ordinariæ, Form I., 20.

† Although this matter has been repeatedly and ably discussed heretofore, (Vide "The Pastor," Vol. IV., 1; V., 12; VI., 12), and is also mentioned in the Compend. S. Liturgiæ, Wapelhorst, n. 33; Quæstiones, Gabriels, qu. 184, we accede to the request made by a worthy correspondent of explaining it in detail the more readily, as we are informed that there are a great number of the clergy who do not avail themselves of the privilege, because it is not known or sufficiently understood.

of Schleswig Holstein (missionary territory), in which the Propaganda explains in a different way, and without any ambiguity, what is evidently the same faculty as the one granted to the missionaries of this country. The faculty of the Vicar Apostolic reads: Singulis secundis feriis non impeditis officio IX lectionum, vel eis impeditis die immediate sequenti, celebrando Missam de Requie in quocumque altari portatili privilegium conceditur liberandi animas secundum ejus intentionem a Purgatorii pœnis per modum suffragii. Interpreting this faculty as it stood, the Vicar found the same difficulty to which we referred above as occurring in our own case. He put it in form of the following doubt (the meaning of which is clear enough) and transmitted it to the Propaganda: "An tale officium IX lectionum dictum privilegium prohibens etiam illud censendum sit quod ritu semiduplici celebretur?" The Propaganda put the doubt before the Congregation of Rites. The latter, instead of answering the query in the customary way, undertakes to define the meaning of said faculty in plain terms: "In casu de quo agitur celebrationem missarum lectarum de Requie—præter Vigilias, Ferias et octavas privilegiatas ac Festa de præcepto servanda—*impediri tantummodo ob occurrentiam officiorum IX lectionum quæ gaudeant ritu duplicis majoris, aut duplicis primæ vel secundæ classis.* (8) Now, although this interpretation of a common faculty * is not addressed to us in particular, we may, nevertheless, legitimately avail ourselves of it. First, because it is evidently the same privilege granted to two countries under similar circumstances, by the same authority. Secondly, because the authority granting the privilege is the same which interprets its meaning. Thirdly, because there is no reason whatever to show that the authority granting the faculty meant to discriminate in the two cases; on the contrary, the faculty of saying private Requiem Masses on days

* The words are not entirely alike, which is not necessary, for even the faculty as it comes to us is not invariably couched in the same words, though there can be no question as to the identity of their sense.

of minor or double rite had already been granted in several instances to Bishops in this country at their request.* Others, it is true, obtained similar privileges after the above explanation had been given,† which might imply that, if these faculties meant really what we contend for, the S. Congregation would not have again granted the same under a new title. But even if these newly granted faculties were entirely the same, it is well known that the S. Congregation does not generally enter into the history of what privileges any one who asks a new one already possesses. She grants or refuses ordinarily on the sole merits of the case presented. We may simply argue that the petitioners had not interpreted the faculty they possssed in the sense in which it could be legitimately understood, in the light of an authoritative explanation which had not been generally promulgated. For the rest, as soon as the sense of the privilege, as given to the Vicar-Apostolic of Holstein, became sufficiently known, it was accepted by those who professedly dealt with the matter of liturgy in its connection with our faculties. ‡

There seems, then, no reason to doubt that those priests in the United States who enjoy the faculty cited, have the privilege of saying a Requiem Mass on all Mondays during the year, excepting the privileged vigils (Christm., Epiph., Pentec.), the priv. Ferials (Ashwedn., Holy Week), priv. Octaves (Christm., Epiph., Easter, Pentec., Corp. Christi), the holy days of obligation, (Christm., New Year, Assumpt., All Saints, Imm. Concept.), Feasts double major of the first or second class, as given in the Ordo. To these must be added, as doubles of the first class, the Titular Feast of the church, whether consecrated or only blessed, to which a regular

* The Second Prov. Synod of St. Louis requested and obtained an Indult "jam aliis regionibus concessum Missam privatam de Requie celebrandi die obitus, etc., in festis duplicibus; et etiam Missam de Requie bis in mense festis duplicibus celebrandi extra diem obitus, etc. (S. C. Prop. 19 Jan. 1859.)

† Cincinnati, 18 July, 1880.—Milwaukee, 18 June, 1882 (three times a week).

‡ Vide Compend. S. Liturgiæ. P. In. Wapelhorst, n. 33, p. 54.—Quæstiones in Rubr. Gabriels, who cites "The Pastor."

clergy (stricte adscripti) is attached. Also the Forty Hours' devotion, or any exposition of the Blessed Sacrament *ob publicam causam;* for a Requiem Mass cannot be said in the church under these circumstances, (9) unless on All Souls' Day (10). Even then it may not be said at the altar where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, but at another, and in violet vestments. If the Blessed Sacrament is exposed simply for the devotion of the faithful, Mass may be said de Requie, but not at the altar of exposition, and in violet color (11). If a Mass is to be said at the altar of exposition, and that altar be privileged, the indulgence is gained by the Mass of the day, or by a votive Mass (12). If, however, the statutes ordain that on a certain day the missa de die is to be said, when otherwise a Requiem were allowed by the rubrics or by special faculty, the Indulgence is lost for the time (13).

If the enumerated cases hinder the Requiem Mass for Monday, the privilege of *saying the Mass in black* is transferred to Tuesday under the same conditions, but it lapses after that. As for the *Indulgence*, it is always attached to the Requiem Mass if that can be said according to the Rubrics, or by reason of a special faculty. Otherwise it is gained on Monday by the Mass of the day.

DECREES REFERRED TO IN THE ABOVE:

(1). Enunciata Decreta (S. C. R. de alt. privileg.) intelligenda esse de missa defunctorum seu de Requie, quæ omnino in casu dicenda est quando a Rubrica permittitur.—(Decr. Auth. n. 5123, 22 Jul., 1848.)

(2). Dub.: Utrum diruto altari privileg. privilegium non pereat, sed reædificato altari sub eodem titulo reviviscat?—*Affirmative.* (S. C. I. in die 24 Apr., 1842.)

(3). Quid si præfatum altare non eodem sed in diverso ecclesiæ loco denuo erigatur licet sub eodem titulo?—*Affirmative.* (S. C. I., 30 Aug., 1847).

(4). Quid tandem si ecclesia non in eodem loco sed alibi reædificatur?—*Negative.* (S. C. I., 30 Aug., 1847.)

(5). Utrum sacerdos gaudens privilegio personali altaris possit in hebdomada cum recurrit festum duplex, celebrare et lucrari indulgentias, an debeat expectare festa semiduplicia ad easdem lucrandas?—*Affirmative*, quatenus non occurrant festa semiduplicia in hebdomada. (S. C. I., 20 Aug., 1864.)

(6). An sacerdos qui missam celebrat pro defuncto eidemque applicat indulgentiam plenariam altaris privilegiati, possit eodem die vi sacræ communionis in missæ sacri-

ficio peractæ, lucrari aliam indulg. plenar. vel sibi vel defunctis applicabilem, si ad hanc lucrandam præscribitur S. Communio.—*Affirmative.* (S. C. I., 10 Maj., 1844.)

(7). Sacerdos qui gaudet privilegio alt. personalis, si sit aggregatus alicui congregationi quæ etiam dicto privilegio gaudet, potest adhuc frui alio privilegio, licet aliunde jam habeat per tres aut quatuor vices in hebdomada tale privilegium, dummodo in Indultis aliter expresse non disponatur.—(S. C. I., 27 Maj., 1839.)

(8). Rmo. D. hodierno Vicario Apostolico Holstein Slewigis a S. C. de Propag. Fide circa celebrationem Missarum de Requie concessum fuit privilegium quod sic se habet: Singulis secundis Feriis non impeditis officio novem lectionum vel eis impeditis die immediate sequenti celebrando Missam de Requie in quocumque altari portatili privilegium conceditur liberandi animas secundum ejus intentionem a Purgatorii pœnis per modum suffragii. Quum circa hoc privilegium nonnullæ exortæ fuerint difficultates, præfatus Rmus Orator ab eadem S. Congregatione insequentium dubiorum solutionem expetit, nimirum:

Dub. I.—An tale officium ix lectionum dictum privilegium prohibens etiam illud censendum sit quod ritu semiduplici celebretur?

Dub. II.—An in casu quo impedita feria ii etiam dies immediate sequens seu feria iii similiter impedita sit officio ix lectionum (id quod sæpe evenit secundum Kalendarii nostri dispositionem) privilegium supradictum pro tali hebdomada omnino cesset?

Quum autem memorata Congregatio eadem dubia pro opportuna solutione ad S. R. Congregationem transmiserit, hæc audita relatione ab infrascripto Secret. facta nec non voto Rmi. D. S. R. Congr. Assessoris, declaravit: In casu de quo agitur celebrationem Missarum lectarum de Requie præter Vigilias, Ferias et Octavas privilegiatas ac Festa de præcepto servanda impediri tantummodo ob occurrentiam officiorum ix lectionum quæ gaudent ritu duplicis majoris, aut duplicis primæ vel secundæ classis.—Atque ita declaravit die 4 Sept. 1875. (Decr. Auth. 5629).

(9). Durante expositione SSi. occasione 40 hh. in tali ecclesia celebrari non potest Missa privata de Requie quando alias dies ipsa eam admittit. Idem de Missa cantata de Requie, etc.—(S. R. C., 27 Apr., 1697).

(10). In expositione SSi occasione 40 hh. in die commemorationis omnium fidelium defunct. licet celebrare missam solemnem et etiam privatam itidem defunctorum. n. 4477. (S. R. C., 16 Sept., 1801).

(11). Missæ de Requie extra altare ubi est expositum SS., etiam in pyxide, poterunt celebrari, dummodo oratio coram SSo. non sit ex publica causa.—(S. R. C. 7 Maji, 1746).

Ut fruatur altari privilegiato sacerdos diebus non impeditis celebrare debet missam defunct. et uti paramentis nigris *vel ex rationabili causa violaceis.*—(S. C I., 16 Feb., 1852).

(12). Missa de semidupl. vel voto vel de feria celebrata in altari privilegiato in quo est expositum SS. Sacramentum sive in Ostensorio sive in Ciborio suffragatur defunctis ac si de Requie diceretur.—(S. C. I., 20 Jul., 1751).

(13). Dub: Utrum Indulg. pro defunct. iis applicari possit in Missis in altari privilegiato celebratis quando ex statuto de die aut festo celebratur iis diebus in quibus habetur Missa de festo etiam simplici aut propria de feria et in feriis adventus?—S. C. I. Juxta votum magistri cæremoniarum: *Negative.* (27 Aug., 1836).

CONFERENCE.

NOTES ON THE LENTEN INDULT.

A PIECE of bread with the morning potion (two ounces of nutritious matter in all, says Lehmk. I. 1211).

Coffee, tea, etc. are permitted during the day, even with a slight admixture of sugar and milk.

The evening refection—eight ounces. This is understood of solid food of a light kind. Breadpudding, mush, pulse, and the like, by fermenting, when taken with a certain quantity of liquid, increase in substance. Hence four or five ounces of such food, when taken with the ordinary amount of drink, equal the quantity generally allowed. St. Alphonsus observes that to dip one's bread in liquid is not the same as drinking. Lard is licitly used for the preparation of the principal meal and the refection. The Sacred Penitentiary says *liquid lard*, which may be interpreted, so that it melt in the cooking of the food. By lard is understood only "the fat of the hog," not of any animal. (Sab. 334, qu. 2.)

When by dispensation meat is allowed on certain days, fish and meat are not permitted at the same meal. Fish here includes sea turtle, oysters, crabs, clams, lobsters. This law "de non permiscendis epulis" applies also to Sundays in Lent and all *fast days* * during the year.

Resp. S. Pœnit. 8 Jan. 1834. (Sab. 334, qu. 5)

The law of not eating meat and fish at the same meal binds also those who are *dispensed from the fast by reason of the Indult*. It does not bind those who are otherwise dispensed,

* It does not apply to abstinence days, so that a person dispensed from the Friday abstinence is free to take fish and meat at the same meal.

such as the sick, etc., for whom the Lenten regulations do not exist. (Ibid., qu. 7).

Those who are dispensed from the fast can eat meat, eggs, etc., several times on those days on which the Lenten Indult permits the eating of meat at one meal.

An interruption of a quarter or even half hour at the principal meal does not prevent a person from returning to it, even if he had considered it finished. (Lehmk. I., xii., 12).

Excused from fasting are, in general, men after their sixtieth year, (women even earlier) persons performing hard labor, even if they could fast presumably without injury to their health. (Sab. 337, qu. 3).

Soldiers and sailors in active service, and their families if they live with them, are exempt from fast by a special Indult, except for the following days: Ashwednesday, the three last days of Holy Week, (on Holy Thursday meat is permitted to all), the Vigils of the Assumption B. V. M., and of Christmas. This indult does not include soldiers and sailors on leave of absence. As to the officers, individual circumstances must be regarded.

COLLECTION ON THE FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

1. The first Sunday of Lent calls, according to Decree 243 of the Third Plenary Council, for a collection in behalf of the Indians and negroes.*

2. All the Faithful who on this day, after a good confession and holy Communion, pray for the spread of holy Faith, and according to the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff, gain a Plenary Indulgence.†

* In universis harum regionum diœcesibus quotannis, prima Quadragesimæ Dominica, collecta fiat, et summa inde proveniens mittatur ad commissionem pro missionibus domesticis instituendam. Decr. Conc. Pl. B. III., Tit. viii., 243.

† "Indulgentiam plenariam benigne concessit ab omnibus et singulis utriusque sexus fidelibus lucrandam, qui eo die quo fit collectio pro erectione et sustentatione sacellorum et scholarum catholicorum pro Indis et Nigritis, vere pœnitentes, sacramentaliter confessi ac S. communione refecti, ecclesiam, in qua pecunia colligitur, devote visitaverint, ibique S. concionibus aliisque ritibus ea occasione celebrandis

3. The sermons of the day, as is implied in the words granting the indulgence, are to be directed towards this object of charity.

The condition of both races is pitiable in the extreme. "We have more than a million colored children in the Southern States who never darken the door of any schoolroom, for the simple reason that there are no schools within their reach." * The Indians are similarly situated. They cannot help themselves, which only education would fit them to do. Though there is no limit to the need of laborers in this field, there are, beside a number of the secular clergy, the Josephite Fathers, the Benedictines, and Jesuits, together with a devoted flock of religious women, whose aid is essential for the schools, ready to work wherever they can get a roof to cover them. But they need means. "Fine talk will not help the cause. Money and hard work are needed," writes one zealous missionary. We priests can easily further this great charity, and thereby benefit none more than ourselves. If, perchance, a soul in our care has been lost, or neglected, for whom we are to answer, here reparation can be made by aiding some of those millions, who lie in darkness in the midst of a Christian and civilized people, to obtain the light of salvation. It is a patriotic work, more lasting and beneficial than "abolition." It opens the hearts of our people to greater generosity, and, far from weakening their interests in the home needs of the parish, they will only be disposed to greater generosity, for such is the law of human nature.

ORATIO SUPER POPULUM.

The *oratio super populum*, which occurs in *ferial Masses* from Ashwednesday to Wednesday in Holy Week, is said *under a*

adstiterint, et aliquas pias preces pro S. Fidei propagatione et juxta S. Pontificis intentionem effuderint." In Audientia vero habita die 3 Dec. 1882 Sanctitas sua rogata fuit,—ut in rescripto auferatur conditio qua fideles tenentur assistere functionibus, concioni, etc. Porro SS. Pater "annuit juxta petita." (Ibid.)

* For a full account of these misssions, see two excellent articles in the current February and March numbers of "The Catholic World."

separate conclusion. In saying *Oremus,* the celebrant extends and joins his hands in the usual manner, bowing to the cross. Then, without further inclination, and with hands joined, he adds: *Humiliate capita vestra Deo;* then separates his hands and continues the oration in the usual manner. The celebrant never turns to the people. (De Herdt, I. n. 290).

In *solemn* ferial Mass the celebrant sings *oremus,* the *deacon,* turning by his left *towards the* people sings: Humiliate capita vestra Deo. (Wapelh. Comp. S. Liturg., n. 96, 6).

THE "STATIONS" NOT COVERED IN PASSION WEEK.

Must the Stations of the Cross in our Churches be covered during Passion week, according to the Rubric: In ecclesia ante Vesperas velantur Cruces et Imagines quæ non deteguntur usque ad Sabb. Sanctum?

By a decree of the S. Cong. of Rites the Stations of the Cross need not be covered.

Dub. Utrum imagines, quæ quatuordecim Viæ Crucis stationibus affigi solent ad instruendos fideles eorumque pietatem fovendam, relinqui possint non velatæ tempore Passionis?

Resp: *Affirmative.* S. R. C. d. 18 Julii 1885.

THE ALTAR OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT ON HOLY THURSDAY.

Can the altar on which the Blessed Sacrament is placed for the adoration of the faithful on Holy Thursday be decorated by figures and ornaments which represent the Holy Sepulchre, as is done in some places, or is the Institution of the Most Blessed Sacrament to be kept before the faithful as the principal object of the adoration?

The Congr. of Rites, to whom the question was referred, answered, May 14, 1887, in conformity with several other decrees, that the altar on Holy Thursday is to represent the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament, and not the Tomb of Our Lord. The decree may be found in the Acta S. Sedis. vol. xix. 602.

ANALECTA.

CAN NON-CATHOLICS BE BURIED IN CONSECRATED GROUND?

A QUESTION has been raised from time to time, as to the meaning of a clause in the Decrees of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, regarding the burial of non-Catholics in the family-vaults of Catholics. The sentence referred to reads: "Ex mente Sedis Apostolicæ toleratur, ut in sepulchris gentilitiis, quæ videlicet privata et peculiaria pro Catholicis laicorum familiis ædificantur, cognatorum et affinium etiam acatholicorum corpora tumulentur." * Some of our prelates believed that the passage had reference only to family-vaults on the private estates of Catholics, and that it did not imply the right to have non-Catholic members of a family, possessing a private vault in a consecrated cemetery, buried in the latter. Others took the sentence in its literal meaning, and argued the reverse. The question was finally referred to the Holy See in the year 1887, but thus far apparently no answer has been received. As the clause in question is taken from the Provincial Council of Prague, held in the year 1860, an eminent and well-informed ecclesiastic of that arch-diocese was written to with a view of ascertaining the practice actually prevailing in his diocese, inasmuch as custom is the best interpreter of laws. The subjoined answer was received by one of our Prelates, through whose courtesy we are permitted to publish it:

"Sepulchra gentilitia ante omnia spectant ad familias nobilium, quæ peculiares capellas vel cryptas habere solent, ubi cuncta stirpis ejusdem membra inveniunt sepulturam. Quam-

* Conc. Plen. Balt. II., Decr. Tit. VII., 389 ad fin.

vis vero familia talis a longævo tempore S. Ecclesiæ Catholicæ sit adscripta, nihilominus nonnunquam evenit ut e matrimonio mixto uxor moriatur acatholica, quam e communi totius gentis sepulchro excludere durum videtur, unde, Sancta Sede permittente, personæ tales in crypta seu capella solent sepeliri.

"Praxis hæc dein et ad alias familias honestas extendebatur, sed solummodo in eo casu, si crypta jam longiori tempore ante mortem cujusdam acatholici cognati vel affinis in possessione erat ejusdem familiæ catholicæ. Non vero permittitur ut demum occasione mortis alicujus personæ acatholicæ sepulchrum gentilitium in cœmeterio acquiratur catholico, cum hoc in fraudem legis eveniret.

"Ex dictis jam satis elucet, hujusmodi acatholicos revera sepeliri in cœmeteriis rite benedictis, quum cryptæ gentilitiæ sive sint in quadam capella constitutæ, sive in cœmeterio communi, semper solemniter benedicantur, et etiam cœmeteria fere omnia in hac provincia non (sic dicta) communalia sint sed catholica quæ in toto solent benedici, exclusa solum parte illa, quæ, legibus civilibus sic jubentibus, pro acatholicorum sepultura destinatur, quæ pars per murum vel per aliquam saltem sepem a cœmeterio catholico separatur."

Genuflection before the Blessed Sacrament.

The question of what kind of genuflections are, under various circumstances, prescribed by the Rubrics, has been recently discussed by the *Academia Liturgica Romana*, and the answers given seem to settle some hitherto disputed points.

We select those phases which bear more directly upon our praxis.

The Rubrics distinguish two kinds of genuflections, the *simplex genuflexio, i.e.*, bending the right knee down to the ground, and the *duplex genuflexio, i.e.*, bending both knees and bowing the body. The former genuflection is used before the Blessed Sacrament when reserved in the Tabernacle, before the relic of the Cross, on specified occasions before the

Crucifix, in receiving the blessing of the Sovereign Pontiff, as also that of the diocesan bishop. The double genuflection is only used before the Blessed Sacrament publicly exposed.

As regards the bowing of the head and body in conjunction with the latter genuflection, the Rubrics say nothing. If we consult the best commentators there remains no doubt, "eam comitari debere *profundam corporis inclinationem.*" So Martinucci, (Manuale Sacr. cærem. Lib. i., cap. i., n. 5 and 6), Merati, (pars. iv., tit, 12), A. Carpo, (Cærem. I., cap. iii., n. 12), and others.

Not so in the simple genuflection on one knee, which is made without any additional inclination of the head.

But is the celebrant or deacon, who exposes the Blessed Sacrament, always to genuflect on both knees in solemn presence of the latter?

The Clementine Instruction for the "Forty Hours' Adoration" prescribes: Every one (omnis cujuscumque conditionis et ordinis) *approaching to or receding from* the Blessed Sacrament, when publicly exposed, must genuflect on both knees, (accedens aut recedens ab ipso, ambobus provolutis genibus reverentiam agere debet). The S. Congregation of Rites, when asked (12 Nov. 1881, n. 4069) the question, "Genuflexio, quæ fit coram SSo. exposito .... *quando* fieri debet *unico*, et quando *utroque* genu, tum a celebrante tum a ministris, vel ab alio qui exponit et reponit?" answered: "In accessu et recessu utroque genu, intra Missam unico genu, pro reliquis functionibus consulantur rubricistæ." The Rubricists stand for the simple genuflection.

Hence the celebrant, as well as the deacon, when they expose and repose the Blessed Sacrament, genuflect on only one knee. In the same manner the celebrant, before and after he gives the blessing with the pyxis or remonstrance, genuflects only on one knee. The same appears to hold good for the other ministers, unless they approach from outside of the sanctuary or leave it.

The objection was urged that it is the practice in some

churches, among them the Vaticana in Rome, for the acolytes to genuflect *utroque genu* on leaving the choir after the elevation in solemn Mass. Some good authorities are also mentioned among Rubricists endorsing the practice. The answer of the Academia implies that, although such practice may be respected where an ancient custom has sanctioned it, it has no foundation in the Rubrics, since the Blessed Sacrament, although upon the altar, may be considered as not exposed to the sight of the acolytes. De Herdt makes the distinction "illud esse in altari *quasi esset* in tabernaculo," not "*ac si* esset in tabernaculo."

The custom, therefore, of genuflecting on both knees in exposing, etc., the Blessed Sacrament, endorsed by some of the Diocesan Statutes, (vide "Ritus servandus in expos." ex Append, Conc. Prov. Cinc. III.—Collect. Lac., tom. iii.) is contrary to the decision of the Academia, which body enjoys quasi-official authority of interpreting ritual difficulties.

BOOK REVIEW.

PONTIFICALE ROMANUM SUMMORUM PONTIFICUM JUSSU EDITUM A BENEDICTO XIV. ET LEONE XIII. PONT. MAX. RECOGNITUM ET CASTIGATUM. CUM CANTU S. RIT. CONGREG. Editio typica. Tres Partes. Fridericus Pustet. mdccclxxxviii.

This splendid volume terminates the series of liturgical works which the S. Congregation of Rites has declared models, after which henceforth all the editions of such work must conform, "nothing added, omitted, or changed," as the Decree of the Prefect of the Congreg., Card. Bianchi, states. In this new edition of the Pontifical all the discrepancies which it formerly contained have been harmonized with the other liturgical books, and the latest decrees of the Cong. of Rites and the Council have been applied. This is true not only of the text but of the chant, which has been declared as definite norm for all future editions of the Pontifical. The Appendix, containing the principal pontifical functions taken from the Rituale Episcoporum made originally for the edition of 1848, has been added to this edition. It also contains the long desired form of the Dedication of a church, when several altars are consecrated at once, and likewise that of the consecration for several altars (tam fixorum quam portatilium) with reference to the latest decrees. It is a pleasure to open this volume, gotten up in the beautiful style which becomes its purpose and bound in dark purple morocco, so that one naturally falls in with the elegant invitation which precedes it:

"Vade, liber, nunquam simili procedere cultu
"Ante datum."

The three volumes separately bound would prove in many cases more serviceable, as there is no index to the complete work at the end of the last.

MISCELLANIES, By Henry Edward, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Vol. III. London: Burnes and Oates. New York: Cathol. Publ. Society Co. 1888.

This volume of the Miscellanies contains twenty-seven articles which have appeared mainly during the last eight years in the English and American Reviews. The subjects are of a living interest handling in the well known clear and pithy style of Cardinal Manning

various educational, social, political, and religious questions, which have agitated and are still occupying the modern mind. "The Catholic Church and Modern Society" and "The Church its own Witness," both addressed to the American public at the instance of Thorndike Rice, must have done immense good among the ranks of unprejudiced Americans of every creed, and we cannot afford to let these papers, matchless in their argumentative power and practical grasp, pass into oblivion amongst ourselves.

MANUAL OF CONFIRMATION, CONTAINING INSTRUCTIONS AND DEVOTIONS FOR CONFIRMATION CLASSES. In two parts. By P. J. Schmitt, Rector, formerly Professor. New York: Jos. Schaefer. 1888.

The author wished to supply a want in the English Catechetical literature of our day and with admirable zeal has gathered together the chief heads of doctrine and practice on the subject of Confirmation. To the instructors of Confirmation classes this book will prove a great help, also to adults who may prepare for this most fruitful sacrament, the graces of which were never needed more than in these days of liberal Christianity. We imagine it would facilitate the use of the book if the definitions as well as the general headings were given in stronger letter type than the explanations. This would also make it more useful for children.

THE BEAUTIES OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH; OR HER FESTIVALS AND HER RITES AND CEREMONIES POPULARLY EXPLAINED. Transl. from the German of Rev. H. Himioben, by Rev. F. J. Shadler. Eighth Edit. Pustet & Co. 1889.

The new year brings a new English edition of this work. Anything which contributes to the better understanding of the rites of our holy Church needs to be recommended. The fact that for the last eight years there has been a new issue each year tells sufficiently what a demand there has been for a book which contains much useful sermon matter to aid the missionary and is likewise a good handbook for Sunday reading among the people.

CATHOLIC WORSHIP, THE SACRAMENTS, CEREMONIES, AND FESTIVALS OF THE CHURCH EXPLAINED. By Rev. O. Gisler. Transl. by Rev. Rich. Brennan, L.L.D. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1888.

Similar to the foregoing, though much smaller, this little book contains a clear exposition, in catechetical form, of the meaning and object of the sacraments, ceremonies, and festivals of the Church. As we said, there can never be enough of such books, practical in matter and handy in get-up. A priest may save himself much labor by

distributing such works, which cost but a trifle, in church and school.

SHORT INSTRUCTIONS IN THE ART OF SINGING PLAIN CHANT, WITH APPENDIX CONTAINING VESPERS, PSALMS, HYMNS, ETC. DESIGNED FOR THE USE OF CATHOLIC CHOIRS AND SCHOOLS. By J. Singenberger. Third Revised and Enlarged Edition. 1888. Fr. Pustet & Co.

"We deem it very desirable," says the last Baltimore Council, "that the rudiments of Gregorian Chant be explained and taught in our parochial schools, in order that there may be an increase in the number of those who are able to sing the Psalms well, and that the greater portion of our people may gradually learn to sing Vespers, etc." How edifying it would be if this were carried out. We owe a great debt to the author whose unremitting zeal in this field has made it possible to do so and to introduce eventually congregational singing, whereby the barrenness of the Vesper service as it is carried out in many places, in a mechanical way, whilst the good people say their prayers and the indifferent folk feel tired, may give place to a joyful participation in one of the most beautiful devotions of the Church.

MANUALE SACERDOTUM DIVERSIS EORUM USIBUS ACCOMODAVIT P. JOSEPHUS SCHNEIDER, S. J. Editio Undecima. Cura et studio Augustini Lehmkuhl, S. J. Coloniæ, Sumpt. et Typ. Joan. P. Bachemii.

We have been very anxious to recommend Fr. Lehmkuhl's edition of this Manual. It is an open mine, whence every priest may draw without labor the knowledge, and also the strength of heart, he daily needs amid his responsible labors. A Compendium of Theology in its fundamental and most approved principles; a Dictionary of Rubrics with their last and safest interpretations. Meditation and Prayer-book adapted to the rule of the priestly life, this compact volume, no larger than a part of the small Breviary, must become a dear friend to any one who has once made an intelligent attempt to familiarize himself with the general table of its contents. The Book was popular from its very beginning. When F. Lehmkuhl, at the request of its dying author, took to revising it some years ago, there had been forty thousand copies of it sent forth to all parts of the world. Since then it has had two editions under the care of, we may say, the most eminent moral theologian of to-day. It is a library for the poor priest and to those who have to travel upon the mission; but to every one a reliable and ready informant on all subjects that concern us most intimately.